AQ Cumulative Import analyses W/CD Modeling Files

March 4, 2005



1801 J Street Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 444-6666 Fax: (916) 444-8373

Connie Bruins Compliance Manager California Energy Commission 1515 Ninth Street Sacramento, CA 95814-5512

Subject: Amendment of Certification for Inland Empire Energy Center, 01-AFC-017

Dear Ms. Bruins:

On behalf of Calpine, we are pleased to submit the enclosed air quality cumulative impact analysis for the Inland Empire Energy Center (IEEC). As shown in the enclosed analysis, we do not believe that the proposed equipment changes to the IEEC project will result in any new significant cumulative air quality impacts.

If you have any questions or need any additional information, please do not hesitate to call me.

Sincerely,

Gary Rubenstein Senior Partner

Enclosure

cc: Keith Golden, CEC
CEC Dockets Office, Docket #01-AFC-017
Brewster Birdsall, Aspen Environmental
Michael Hatfield, Calpine
Barbara McBride, Calpine
Jenifer Morris, Calpine
Mark Smolley, Calpine

DOCKET
01-AFC-17C
DATE MAR 0 4 2005
RECD. APR 1 5 2005

Cumulative Air Quality Impacts Analysis IEEC Project

The following analysis was performed to determine the cumulative air quality impacts associated with proposed design changes for the IEEC project. This analysis was performed pursuant to the cumulative impact analysis protocol in the 2001 AFC for the IEEC project (see September 2001 AFC, Appendix K8). As discussed below, the cumulative impacts of the proposed design changes and other new/modified emission sources in the project area are not expected to cause a new violation or contribute to an existing violation of any state or federal air quality standard in the project area.

The new and modified emissions sources in the IEEC project area were identified through a request of permit records from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The search was requested for new or modified emission sources located within 10 km of the IEEC project site that had a net emission increase of any size for NOx, CO, SOx, or PM₁₀. The database search focused on all new ATCs issued or permit applications filed in the time period from January 2002 to February 2005. This time period was selected based on the typical length of time needed for construction to ensure that new equipment that are not reflected in the 2000-2003 ambient air quality data used for the refined modeling are included in the cumulative impact analysis. Based on the above search criteria, the SCAQMD performed a database search that identified a total of approximately 375 emission sources that had been the subject of a permit application during the requested period. Of this number, only 11 permit actions resulted in net emission increases of NOx, CO, SOx, or PM₁₀ and were within 10 km of the IEEC project site. The detailed list of the 375 emission sources is included as Attachment 1. Of these 11 permit actions, only one has a net emissions increase above the 10 lbs/day de minimis level shown in the cumulative impact analysis protocol included in the 2001 AFC for the IEEC project (Pomeroy Corporation). At the request of the CEC air quality staff, two additional emission sources at a concrete batch plant near Romoland (Orco Block Company) were added to the list due to their close proximity to the IEEC site. Consequently, the final list of new/modified sources included in the cumulative impacts analysis is comprised of a total of three emission units.

Cumulative Emissions Impact

A detailed description of the three new/modified emission sources is included as Attachment 2. This list of new/modified sources includes the company name, company address, distance from the IEEC project site, emission levels, and exhaust stack parameters. The emission levels for the three new/modified sources were provided by the SCAQMD as part of its database search. Because information regarding the exhaust stack characteristics of the sources was not available from the SCAQMD, it was necessary to use default stack parameters for the listed sources. The default stack parameters were derived from the following sources, and these default parameters have been approved by the CEC staff for previous cumulative impact analyses:

- Boiler default stack parameters based on a 20 MMBtu/hr natural gas-fired boiler at an industrial facility in Fontana.
- Reciprocating internal combustion engine default stack parameters based on parameters provided by the CEC for a Cummins Diesel engine rated at greater than 500 hp.
- Cement molding machine baghouse based on a baghouse installed on a cement storage silo at a Portland cement plant in Davenport, California.

The emission characteristics and stack parameters for the proposed IEEC project are discussed in detail in the air quality impact section of the March 2005 CEC Amendment Number 1, and will not be repeated here.

Using the methodologies outlined above, emissions were calculated on an hourly, daily, and annual basis for the IEEC project and the three new/modified sources. Tables 1, 2, and 3 show the hourly, daily, and annual emissions, respectively, for the IEEC project and three listed new/modified sources. The maximum hourly combined NOx emission level of 816 lbs/hr for the gas turbines shown in Table 1 is higher then the 550 lbs/hr shown in the March 2005 CEC Amendment Number 1. This increase in the allowable startup NOx emission level for the gas turbines is a result of a revised startup modeling analysis done in response to a recent CEC staff information request. Additional details regarding this revised modeling approach are discussed below. As discussed above, the detailed emission summary for the three listed new/modified sources is included as Attachment 2.

Table 1
Maximum Hourly Emissions from Sources Included in Cumulative Impacts Analysis (lbs/hr)

Emissions Source	NOx	со	SOx	PM ₁₀
IEEC Gas Turbines (startup/commissioning)	816.0	794.2	3.7	20.0
IEEC Other Equipment	43.1	12.1	1.1	4.8
IEEC Project Total	859.1	806.3	4.8	24.8
3 New/Modified Sources	0.7	0.6	0.0	0.2

Table 2
Maximum Daily Emissions from Sources Included in Cumulative Impacts Analysis (lbs/day)

Emissions Source	NOx	co	SOx	PM ₁₀
IEEC Project	2,565.9	1,394.5	96.4	591.8
3 New/Modified Sources	17.0	15.0	1.0	5.0

Table 3

Maximum Annual Emissions Included in Cumulative Impacts Analysis (tons/year)

Emissions Source	NOx	СО	SO _x	PM ₁₀
IEEC Project	214.6	188.8	16.2	104.2
3 New/Modified Sources	3.1	2.7	0.2	0.9

Analysis of Ambient Impacts

As with the refined modeling included in the March 2005 CEC Amendment Number 1, the Industrial Source Complex Short Term (ISCST) and CTSCREEN dispersion models were used to evaluate the combined impacts for the IEEC project and the three new/modified sources. The models were used with meteorological data collected during 1981 at the nearby Riverside monitoring station. The SCAQMD has previously determined that this meteorological data set is representative of meteorological conditions in the IEEC project area. The coarse receptor grid used for the refined modeling performed for the IEEC project was also used for the cumulative impact analysis. A description of this receptor grid is included in the 2001 AFC for the IEEC project (AFC Section 5.2.3.2.2). Enclosed as Attachment 3 is a compact disk containing the modeling input and output files.

The new emissions sources associated with the IEEC project were modeled as individual point sources, using the stack parameters and emission rates included in the March 2005 CEC Amendment Number 1. The three new/modified sources were also modeled as individual point sources based on the emission levels and stack characteristics shown in Attachment 2.

The maximum modeled concentrations for each pollutant and averaging period from all sources combined are shown in Table 4, along with the individual contribution of the IEEC project and the three new/modified sources. For the IEEC project, Table 4 shows the maximum project impacts at any receptor location and the maximum project impact at the receptor location where the maximum cumulative impacts occur. The IEEC project maximum 1-hr NO2 impacts in Table 4 are different then the impacts shown in the March 2005 CEC Amendment Number 1 due to a change from individual to source-group ozone limiting method (OLM) corrections to the 1-hr NO2 modeled impacts. This change in the OLM correction method was recommended in a recent CEC staff information request for the IEEC project. The change in the OLM correction method enabled an increase in the allowable combined NOx emissions for the gas turbines during startups as shown above in Table 1. The maximum modeled cumulative concentrations are summarized in Table 5 and compared with the state and federal ambient air quality standards.

As shown in Table 4, at the point of maximum combined impact there is very little overlap between the IEEC project and the three new/modified sources. For all of the pollutants and averaging periods, the three new/modified sources' contribution at the

point of maximum combined impact is almost nondetectable by the ISCST3/CTSCREEN models. The modeling results show that the maximum combined impacts of the IEEC project and the three new/modified projects are not expected to cause any violations of the state or federal CO, SO₂, or NO₂ standards. In addition, the modeled PM₁₀ impacts by themselves are well below federal and state ambient air quality standards. However, since the federal and state PM₁₀ standards are already exceeded in the area, any increase in ambient PM₁₀ levels will contribute to an existing violation. From the information about source contributions in Table 4, it can be seen that these projected violations would occur even without the proposed IEEC project. In addition, under the SCAQMD permitting program, the IEEC is required to offset all net emissions increases. Consequently, the IEEC project is not expected to cause a new violation or contribute to an existing violation of any state or federal air quality standard in the project area.

Table 4 Source Contribution to Maximum Modeled Concentration (all concentrations in ug/m³)

-		Maximum		
	36 '	Maximum	Combined Maximum	TERCE !
	Maximum	Modeled Impact	Modeled Impact for	IEEC Project's
	Modeled	for	IEEC Project and	Contribution to Point
Pollutant/	Impact for	3 New/Modified	3 New/Modified	of Maximum
Avg. Period	IEEC Project	Sources	Sources	Combined Impact
NO_2				_
- annual	$0.8^{a,b}$	$0.2^{a,b}$	0.8	0.8
- 1 hour	197.5 ^{c,d}	4.8 ^{c,d}	197.5	197.5
CO				
- 8 hours	473.8°	2.0°	473.9	473.8
- 1 hour	814.7°	3.5°	815.3	814.7
SO ₂				
- annual	0.2^{c}	0.0^{c}	0.2	0.2
- 24 hours	2.4°	0.1°	2.4	2.4
- 1 hour	58.1°	0.3°	58.1	58.1
PM_{10}				
- annual	1.3°	0.5°	1.3	1.3
- 24 hours	9.1°	3.9°	9.1	9.1
PM _{2.5}				
- annual	1.3°	0.5°	1.3	1.3
- 24 hours	9.1°	3.9 ^c	9.1	9.1

Notes:

- a. Modeled using CTSCREEN
 b. ARM corrected using EPA correction factor of 0.75
 c. Modeled using ISCST3
 d. OLM corrected using source-group approach

Table 5 Comparison of Maximum Modeled Concentrations with Ambient Air Quality Standards
(all concentrations in 119/m³)

	Max. Modeled				
Pollutant/	Impact from	Background		Federal	
Avg. Period	All Sources	Concentration	Total	Standard	State Standard
NO_2					
- annual	0.8	34	35	100	
- 1 hour	197.5	171	369		470
CO					
- 8 hours	473.9	5,126	5,600	10,000	10,000
- 1 hour	815.3	8,010	8,825	40,000	23,000
SO_2					
- annual	0.2	5	5	80	
- 24 hours	2.4	31	33	365	109
- 1 hour	58.1	50	108		650
PM_{10}					
- annual ^a	1.3	45	46	50	20
- 24 hours	9.1	116	125	150	50
PM2.5					
- annual	1.3	30	31	15	12
 24 hours 	9.1	77	86	65	

Notes:

a. Annual arithmetic mean

ATTACHMENT 1 SCAQMD DATABASE SEARCH FOR NEW/MODIFIED EMISSION SOURCES

100 mm 10	19 9 9 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	7 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	9.00	
Size production of the product	・			
Authority and Little				
The state of the s			The state of the s	Contraction of the contraction o
A CONTRACT OF THE CONTRACT OF			THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY O	
entra de la companya			He Sales	
ent comply				
emprovide section (section) (section	13.1 (2.1) (2.2) (2.2) (3.2) (4.2)			2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
20 mm	1.4 文元 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			1
tenty and other	A CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR		The control of the co	
And for Confirm to section to section to the confirm to the confirmation of the confir				
200 Parts 100 Pa	- 1 (1) (2) (2) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1	 		

2.2 Per (1)	3	2.44 0.04(4)		<u> </u>	## B ##
	March 200 care to the way and the control				
			고 등 등 보고 함께 하는 기를 가는 것을 보고 있는 등 등 하는 것을 것을 수 없습니다.		
And the state of t					A Secretarion of the second of
And the second s					e de la companya de l
A control of the cont				Year	Andreas (Constitution of the Constitution of t
A CONTRACTOR				DAL COPPLY DECEMONS	And the second s
			1000000000000000000000000000000000000		:AL :No
A Section of the Control of the Cont	The second of th			,	Colon
10 A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A					
				S. SPANE THE STATE OF THE STATE	
10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1				3 3	
3 (A)					
Service of the second of the s				TO THE CONTROL OF THE	
			da esperte de la compansión de la compan	100 d	

# # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # #	113 103 103 103 103 103 103 103 103 103	(1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1)		
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Star i d	59 65 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		
: :	A THE SALES	<u> </u>	• •	
100	4:		- 01 -	
3		•	- 0-0-	
1 2	State of the section		2 ol o	
	Man i sociato di constanti con segletto del constanti		• • •	
2		E STATE OF THE STA	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	To an and a second
<u> </u>	2	TO COMMON TO THE		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
	And			7 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -
		20000000		
	0.14	JOS Kee		Mary Se Leaf
	Violente Più de la company de			A Discount of the Control of the Con
		and the control of th		To della la
		18		A DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY
			Page In a	See
		5	8	1 00 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10
			A 1	Date of the second of the seco
:			00000000000000000000000000000000000000	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
		# E		A STATE OF THE STA
2			329 0	An included the second of the
	e francisco de la Companya de la Com	4.	A	Participant of the participant o
*		•		Lead of the late o
			1	And Park 1.
	\$# ±	Walter of East of Control of Cont		The part of the control of the contr
		10 A		
,	ens.	\$ 8 	\$ 01 1	A control of the cont
	1			
				The state of the s
		GE 55		The second secon
1			1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
	ð	22	3 3 3	1 (1 (1 (1 (1 (1 (1 (1 (1 (1 (1 (1 (1 (1
	894			100 CONTROL OF THE PROPERTY OF
:	N.,	360		first force of the second of t
į.	COST.	1.0 PM	요. 보면 변경	The second secon
			으로 다 다 다 다 다 다 다 다 다 다 다 다 다 다 다 다 다 다 다	A CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR
				Designation of the control of the co
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		乳周 素	
	2017 TAB	E CO	1100	A CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR OT THE CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR
	The state of the s		100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100	Section 1
2	Secretary of the secretary and second			The control of the co
>	3	4.	到到至	

ATTACHMENT 2

EMISSION LEVELS AND STACK PARAMETERS FOR THREE NEW/MODIFIED SOURCES

ndathre	Cumulative Impact Modeling Inputs - IEEC Project	vuts - IEEC Project											ā •	efault Stack	Stack Stack	Default	Exhau
Facility D Number	Facility	Facility Address	Š	State	d/Z	Application Number	Description of New/Modiffed Emission Source	Nat Emissions Type of Permit Activity (increase(1) CO NOx SOX PM10	Net Emissions (noresse(1)	8	Š	SOX	- 1	Height(2) D (meters)	lameter(2) (meters)) Dlameier(2) Temperature(2) Flow(2) (m/sec)	Flow(2 (m/sec
67698	ORCO BLOCK CO.	67688 ORCO BLOCK CO. 26380 PALOMAR RD ROMOLAND CA	ROMOLAND	5	92585		432415 BOILER (<5 MMBTUMR) NAT GAS ONLY	New equipment	Bashr Basday Basyr	0.25 6.00 2,180.00 1,0	0.13 3.00 1,005.00	00.0	00.00	10.67	0.50	41	11.58
6.7688	ORCO BLOCK CO.	67698 ORCO BLOCK CO. 26380 PALOMAR RD ROMOLAND CA	ROMOLAND	5	92585		402816CONCRETE MOLDING	Modified equipment	Berhr Beday Belyr	0000	0000	0.00	0.17 4.00 460.00	6.09	0.51	28	8.43
141807	POMEROY CORPO	141807 POMEROY CORPO 2020 GOETZ RD	PERRIS	5	92570		433807I.C. ENGINE ASSOCIATED WITH A CONCRETE BATCH SYSTEM IN	New equipment	lbs/hr bs/day lbs/vr	0.38 9.00 3.285.00	0.38 0.58 9.00 14.00	1.00	1.00	4.	0.30	99	33.00

Notes:
1. Entraines based on daily entration isosite provided by the SCACARD. Howely emissions are based on 265 days/year of operation.
2. Defined stack parameters were approved by the CEC for the previous IEEC canulative impact modeling palayles. For the concrete modeling until the default material processing stack parameters were used.

ATTACHMENT 3 AIR QUALITY CUMULATIVE IMPACT MODELING CD